REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the Office Action dated February 23, 2007.
Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the following
remarks.

Claims 1-5, 6-8 are currently pending, with claims 1 and 5 being independent.

Claims 1, 3-5, are amended. New claims 7 and 8 have been added.

No new matter has been added.

Objection to Drawing

The Drawing has been amended to correct informalities as follows:

With regard to Figure 24, the term "Related Art" is added in compliance with 37 CFR
1.121(d). Therefore, this objection should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 101

**Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 USC § 101 because the claimed invention is
directed to non-statutory subject matter.** This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 6 is canceled and claim 5 is amended. By the amendment attached hereto, the
claimed invention in claim 5 is directed to statutory subject matter. The support for this amendment
is for example found in second and third paragraphs of page 6 in this specification.

> *In response to the request command received by the input receiver 101, the
> bitmap data acquisition unit 103 reads out bitmap data from the bitmap data
> storage unit 102. Typically, the data acquisition unit 103 can be formed by using
> an MPU, a memory, and the like, and all processes assigned thereto are realized
> by **software that is stored in a recording medium such as a ROM**. However,
> hardware implementation (using a dedicated circuit) is also feasible.*

> *The jaggy elimination processing unit 104 eliminates jaggies appearing on
> the bitmap data that was acquired by the bitmap data acquisition unit 103. In order
> to eliminate jaggies, any method can be employed. The kind of algorithm that
> works will be discussed in detail below. Typically, the jaggy elimination processing
> unit 104 can be formed by using an MPU, a memory, and the like, and all
> processes assigned thereto are realized by **software that is stored in a recording
> medium such as a ROM**. However, hardware implementation (using a dedicated
> circuit) is also feasible.* (emphasis added)

Further, MPEP 2106.01 I recites "[s]ince a computer program is merely a set of instructions capable of being executed by a computer, the computer program itself is not a process and USPTO personnel should treat a claim for a computer program, without the computer-readable medium needed to realize the computer program's functionality, as nonstatutory functional descriptive material… (omitted)… When a computer program is recited in conjunction with a physical structure, such as a computer memory, USPTO personnel should treat the claim as a product claim." Here, claims 5 and 8 recites physical structure, namely, "a computer readable medium." Therefore, the rejection is now moot and Applicant respectfully requests to withdraw this rejection. In addition, claims 7 - 9 are added. These claims are directed to statutory subject matter. Therefore this rejection would not apply to these new claims.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Ishida* et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,232,978). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

To establish anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the Office Action must provide a single reference that teaches each and every claim limitation of the rejected claim, either expressly or inherently. MPEP 706.02.

Independent claim 1 now amended, required "transformation rules include a matrix of a dot pattern of n × m **before** transformation and a matrix of a dot pattern of n × m **after** transformation each of which corresponds to each of the before-transformation n x m dot patterns" and "according to said transformation rules, if the matrix of a dot pattern of n x m of said bitmap data matches any one of said n x m dot patterns **before** transformation, said pattern is transformed into the corresponding one of said dot patterns **after** transformation (emphasis added)." *Ishida* does not teach the limitations either expressly or inherently. These limitations are added to claim 1 from claim 4 with certain modification. The rejection reasons to the limitations of claim 4 in the Office Action are incorrect. The Office Action referrers to Fig. 10 Col. 2 lines 1-4, Fig. 11 and col. 2 lines 16-18, and Col. 4 lines 37-42 of Ishida. However, none of the refereed portion of *Ishida* discloses a "transformation rule" having a dot patterns of before and after. Indeed, *Ishida* discloses a 3 x 3 dot pattern in Figs. 10 and 11. However, Fig. 10 illustrates the scanning of the raster-scan binary image

data outputted by the binary image acquisition unit 1 as well as the scanning of the raster-scan binary image data which enters the outline extraction unit 2 (Fig. 10, Col. 2 lines 1-4). Further, Fig. 11 illustrates an example of extraction of contour edge vectors between a pixel of interest and the pixels neighboring (Fig. 11, Col. 2, lines 16-18). Accordingly, Fig. 10 is not related to a "transformation rule" of before, and Fig. 11 is not related to a "transformation rule" of after. Instead of using the existing "transformation rule," *Ishida* rather discloses extracting means for extracting contour vectors of an image from a binary image each time. Thus, *Ishida* fails to disclose the limitations of claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is not anticipated by Ishida. In addition, all claim limitations are not taught or suggested by *Ishida*.

Dependent claims 2-4 depend from claim 1 and are also not anticipated by *Ishida* by virtue of their dependency upon claim 1. Further, independent claim 5 has the same claim limitation referred above. Therefore, claim 5 should be also allowable for the same reason for claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 18-0013, under Order No. IRD-0003 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: May 19, 2008   Respectfully submitted,

                                          By   /Tomoko Nakajima/
                                          Tomoko Nakajima
                                              Registration No.: L0231
                                          RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC
                                          Correspondence Customer Number: 23353
                                          Attorney for Applicant